APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/119,427	07/20/1998	MARY ELLEN SIKSA	WH997-001	1077

7590 05/23/2002

ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY
3173 CEDAR ROAD
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER
ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/119,427	SIKSA ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Charles E Anya	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3/_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _〇-20-1998_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 6, 8 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,601 to Matheny in view of Selby et. al.

As to claim 1, Matheny teaches a System (Personal Computer, Col. 3, Ln. 1 –

23), Event (Checkbox 600), a Window Object (Control Panel, Dialog Box, Sound

Controller), a Plurality of Window Controls (Checkbox 200, Play 800, Step 802, Stop

804, Pause 806, Red 900, Green 910, Blue 920), a Plurality of Control Enhancers

(Checkbox 200, Play 800, Step 802, Stop 804, Pause 806, Red 900, Green 910, Blue

920), an Interface (User Interface, Col. 20, Ln. 54 – 62), a one Specific Control

(Checkbox 200, Checkbox 300, Checkbox 400, Checkbox 510, Checkbox 600).

Matheny is silent with reference to a list of said control enhancers for determining which

of said plurality of control enhancers to invoke to handle the received event.

Sebly teaches a list of said control enhancers for determining which of said

plurality of control enhancers to invoke to handle the received event (Panel Resolution

Table 500). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Sebly to the system of

Matheny. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to select an associated control enhancer.

As to claim 2, Matheny teaches at least one Data Storage handler (Data 230, Data Encapsulator 808).

As to claim 3, Matheny teaches at least one Data Initializer (Command 210, Command 610).

As to claim 5, Matheny teaches a First one of said window controls (Play 800), one Second of said window controls (Stop 804). Matheny is silent with reference to one pointer, one means for determining if an action at said first control enhancer affects said second control enhancer and means for communicating with said second control enhancer.

Selby teaches one Pointer (Depend On ID), one means for determining if an action at said first control enhancer affects said second control enhancer (Panel resolution Table 500), means for communicating with said second control enhancer (Depend On ID). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the system of Matheny. One would have been motivated to make such modifications in order to resolve relationship issues between control enhancers.

As to claim 6, Matheny teaches at least one of said control enhancers further comprises means for determining limits to be placed on data related to said control enhancer ("...as sound must be selected in the appropriate data encapsulator 808...", Col. 19, Ln. 38 – 45).

As to claim 8, Matheny teaches at least one of said control enhancers further comprises means for identifying data related to the window control of said at said one control enhancer (Command 210, Command 310, Command 520, Command 610).

As to claim 9, claims 1 and 4 meets claim 9, expect for each of said control enhancers comprising at least one data storage handler, and at least one data initializer.

Matheny teaches at least one data storage handler (Data 230, Data 320, Data 620, Data Encapsulator 808), at least one data initializer (Command 210, Command 610).

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 6.

As to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 7.

As to claim 13, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 14, Matheny teaches window Controls (Control Panel, Sound Control Panel, Dialog Box, Color Editor), a Plurality of control enhancers (Checkbox 300, Play 800, Step 802, Stop 804, Pause 806), Receiving an event at said window (Checkbox 600), Locating at least one interested control enhancer for said event from said plurality of control enhancers (Checkbox 300, Checkbox 400, Checkbox 510, Checkbox 600), Passing said event to said at least one interested control enhancer (Notification, figure 4, Reflecting the data, Col. 18, Ln. 63 – 67), Handling said at said at least one interested control enhancer (see figure 5 and Col. 19, Ln. 1 – 8). Matheny is silent with reference to at least one event.

Selby teaches at least one event ("...on/off...", Col. 6, Ln. 33 – 36). It would have been

obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the system of Matheny. One would have been

motivated to make such a modification in order to pass an event to an interested control

enhancer.

As to claim 15, Matheny teaches a Control Enhancer List of Events ("...interest

list...", Col. 23, Ln. 20 – 31, "...list of menu items...", Col. 23, Ln. 36 – 40), Accessing

said list of events ("...connection objects...", Col. 23, Ln. 59 – 61), Comparing said

received event to said list of events ("The command...", Col. 23, Ln. 61 – 63) and

Determining interested control enhancers based on said comparing (Notify Menu 1290)

As to claim 16, Matheny teaches said received event as a display event (Checkbox

600).

 Matheny is silent with reference to relationships, determining if said display event

affects at least one of said relationships, evaluating whether at least one rule for said at

least one relationship is true and executing at least one action if said at least one rule is

true.

Selby teaches Relationships (Depend On ID, Dependency Function), determining if said

display event affects at least one of said relationships ("...dependencies are checked for

each control", Col. 6, Ln. 12 – 22), Evaluating whether at least one rule for said at least

one relationship is true ("If the dependency is not equal NULL...", Col. 6, Ln. 12 – 22)

and Executing at least one action if said at least one rule is true ("...enables...", Col. 6,

Ln. 12 – 22). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the system of

Matheny. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order resolve

the relationship between window controls.

3.   Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,601 to Matheny et. al. in view of Selby applied to claims 1 and 6

above, and further in view of Andrew.

As to claim 4, Matheny as applied to claim 1 is silent with reference to at least

one data finalizer.

Andrew teaches at least one data finalizer (Buddy Control, Col. 5, Ln. 37 – 42). It would

have been obvious to apply the teaching of Andrew to system of Matheny as applied to

claim 1. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to

facilitate data storage.

As to claim 7, see the rejection of claim 4.

4.   Claims 17 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,964 to Andrew in view of Matheny.

As to claim 17, Andrew teaches an Enhanced Control ("...control object...", Col.

4, Ln. 35 – 38, , CpropPagePersistent Object), a Window ("...window object...", Col. 4,

Ln. 35 – 38), Instantiating a control enhancer ("...control object...", Col. 4, Ln. 35 – 38,

CPropPagePersistent Object) and Passing a pointer for said control to said control

enhancer (The CPropPersistent object...", Col. 7, Ln. 51 – 56). Andrew is silent with

reference to creating a control on said window.

Matheny teaches creating a control on said window ("When a control is created...", Col.

17, Ln. 35 – 40). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Matheny to the

system of Andrew. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to manipulate display event.

As to claim 18, Andrew teaches Data Handler (Registry Data 303, Buddy Control), Determining if special data handling is required (Buddy Control), Assigning said data handler to said control enhancer (The CpropPagePersistent object...", Col. 7, Ln. 63 – 64). The Examiner is aware that Andrew does not explicitly describe instantiating at least one data handler, but it is inherent that when a CprolPagePersistent object directs the CpersistentComboControl object to persistently store its value (Col. 7, Ln. 11 –15) that a determination of where to store the value and instantiation of the storage area must be resolved.

As to claim 19, Andrew teaches Data Initializer ("...SetActive...", Col. 8, Ln. 25 – 35). The Examiner is aware that Andrew does not explicitly describe determining if special initialization is required, instantiating at least one data initializer if special initialization is required and assigned said at least one data initializer to said control enhancer. However, it is inherent that in the process of initialization, the SetActive method will determine if special initialization is required, instantiating at least one data initializer if special initialization is required and assigned said at least one data initializer to said control enhancer.

As to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 19.

As to claim 21,Andrew teaches Determining if special data finalization is required (Buddy Control, Col. 5, Ln. 33 – 51, Col. 8, Ln. 20 – 23) and Data Finalizer (Buddy Control, Col. 5, Ln. 37 – 42). The Examiner is aware that Andrew does not explicitly

disclose instantiating at least one data finalizer if special finalization is required and

assigning said at least one data finalizer to said control enhancer, but it is inherent that

the data finalizer (Buddy Control) has mechanism for instantiating at least one data

finalizer if special finalization is required and assigning said at least one data finalizer to

said control enhancer, since each control enhancer needs to validate data before

storage.

As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 21.

As to claim 23, see the rejection of claim 21.

As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 21.

5.   Claims 25 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,964 to Andrew in view of Matheny as applied to claim 17 above,

and further in view of Selby.

As to claim 25, Andrew as applied to claim 17 teaches Passing a pointer to each

of said at least one other control enhancer (The CPropPersistent object...", Col. 7, Ln.

51 – 56). Andrew as applied to claim 17 is silent with reference to Determining if said

control has at least on one relationship with at least one other control on said window,

Instantiating said at least one relationship and Assigning said at least one relationship to

said control enhancer.

Selby teaches Determining if said control has at least on one relationship with at least

one other control on said window (Depend On ID, Dependency Function). It would have

been obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the system of Andrew as applied to claim

17. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order resolve the relationship between window controls.

The Examiner is aware that instantiating said at least one relationship is not explicitly disclosed, however, it is inherent that in determining if a control has relationship with another control an instantiation of the relationship has to be performed, if a relationship exists.

As to claim 26, Andrew as applied to claim 17 is silent with reference to instantiating at least one rule for said at least one relationship and assigned said at east one rule to said at least one relationship.

Selby teaches at least one rule ("...not equal...", Col. 6, Ln. 15 – 17) and assigned said at east one rule to said at least one relationship (If dependency is not equal...", Col. 6, Ln. 15 – 17). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the system of Andrew as applied to claim 17. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to determine the type of relationship between window controls.

The Examiner is aware that instantiating at least one rule for said at least one relationship is not explicitly disclosed. However, it is inherent that instantiating at least one rule for said at least one relationship has to be performed in the process of determining the type of relationship between window controls.

As to claim 27, Andrew as applied to claim 17 is silent with reference to instantiating at least one action for said at least one rule and assigned said at east one action to said at least one rule.

Selby teaches at least one action ("...enables or disable...", Col. 6, Ln. 15 – 20) and

assigned said at east one action to said at least one rule (If dependency is not equal...",

Col. 6, Ln. 15 – 20). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Selby to the

system of Andrew as applied to claim 17. One would have been motivated to make

such a modification in order to determine the type of relationship between window

controls.

The Examiner is aware that instantiating at least one action for said at least one rule is

not explicitly disclosed. However, it is inherent that instantiating at least one action for

said at least one rule has to be performed in the process of determining the type of

relationship between window controls.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M – F (First Friday Off) from 8:30 am

to 5:30 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2151

ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER